

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of	)	
	)	
<b>ADHIKARI <i>et al.</i></b>	)	Art Unit: 1618
	)	
Application No. 10/520,414	)	Examiner: Dickinson, Paul W.
	)	
Filing Date: January 6, 2005	)	Confirmation No. 5460
	)	
For: <b>BIODEGRADABLE POLYURETHANE/</b>	)	
<b>UREA COMPOSITIONS</b>	)	

**RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS &  
INGERSOLL, LLP

Customer Number 23859

August 7, 2009

Sir:

This paper is in response to the Request for a Summary of Examiner's Interview dated July 28, 2009. In that request the Examiner set a period in which to reply of no longer than 30 days or one-month from the interview date, *i.e.*, by August 23, 2009. As such, this response is timely.

**Remarks** begin on page 2 of this paper.

**REMARKS**

A response to the non-Final Office Action dated February 3, 2009, was filed, together with a Three-Month Extension of Time, on July 31, 2009. This response was filed prior to Applicants' receipt of the present Request for a Summary of Examiner's Interview. As such, in compliance with this request, Applicants submit the following summary.

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Dickinson for granting a telephone interview on July 23, 2009. Prior to the interview, Applicants provided Examiner Dickinson with a copy of proposed Claim amendments and a draft Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 by co-inventor, Pathiraja Gunatillake. In that interview, the following topics were discussed:

1. The application as a whole;
2. The proposed amendments to Claim 11 wherein the description of the process would be clarified by delineating the process into steps (a) and (b), wherein the reagents comprising each step would be clearly defined;
3. The Examiner's proposal that the term "dendrimer" in the Claims be rewritten as "dendrimeric" to reflect the fact that the term is an adjective; and
3. The Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 wherein co-inventor Gunatillake set forth the differences between Applicants' disclosure and the LaBelle and Cogliano references.

As a result of the interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed Claim amendments would likely overcome the Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In addition, the Examiner indicated that the Declaration by co-inventor Gunatillake was helpful in understanding the differences between the compositions recited in Applicants' claims and the disclosure of the cited references.

**CONCLUSION**

No fee is believed to be due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0629.

Respectfully submitted,

BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS &  
INGERSOLL, LLP

/Richard S. Echler / \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard S. Echler  
Registration No. 41,006

Customer Number 23859  
(678) 420-9300 Phone  
(678) 420-9301 Fax

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8			
I hereby certify that this correspondence, including any items indicated as attached or included, is being transmitted via electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.			
Name of Person Signing (Print/Type)	Richard S. Echler		
Signature	/Richard S. Echler/	Date	August 7, 2009